

---

ALISSA COOPER: Okay great. It sounds like the join notifications have slowed down a little bit, so perhaps we can get started. As usual, Alice is keeping track of who is on the call and will send that around to the mailing list after the call, in case anybody gets missed. But one thing that would be helpful is if anyone is not in the Adobe Connect meeting room, if you can make yourself known right now by saying your name.

MARY: Hello. This is Mary [inaudible]. Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Hi [Mary]. Are you...

MARY: Hi. Yes, I have [inaudible] connection, where I'm not on Adobe [inaudible]... I can only, so you'll not see me raise my hand if I want to speak. I hope you don't mind, I will just ask for floor and not raise my flag.

ALISSA COOPER: Yup, that's fine. Just let us know when you want to speak. And as a reminder, we will be using the raised hand functionality to run the queue today. So if you, at any point, want to get into the queue, everyone who is in the Adobe Connect meeting room should hit the little man with his hand raised.

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

Do we have anyone else who is not in the meeting room? Who is only on the audio bridge?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me this is... If you hear me, please indicate whether... I just want to test, I raised the hand directly in the queue. This is the first time I am using the system, previously I did not use that. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Hi. I heard you, I think we all heard you, but I did not see your hand raised in the meeting interface. So you might want to try again.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I pushed the button, but I don't know what is it called. I pushed the button, and if you can't see that, then I won't be able to talk.

ALISSA COOPER: So, there is actually a little drop down menu, at least on mine, there is a little drop down menu next to the man with his hand raised, and you can select raise hand. So if you want to try again. [Inaudible] raised his hand. Did you have something you wanted to say?

Okay. Well, if people have trouble with the hand raising, I mean, that should be your default. But if for some reason, it doesn't seem to be working, or if I read out the list of who is in the queue, and you don't hear your name and you thought you should be there, just speak up and I'm happy to put you in the queue.

---

So, as you can see, I think in the meeting notes, in the meeting room, we have three agenda items today. The first one is the minutes approval from our two August conference calls. So these minutes have been out on the public mailing list for more than a week, I think, week and a half. So hopefully people have had time to review them.

And I wanted to know if anyone has objections to adopting these minutes and publishing them on the website. And I see Heather in the queue, Heather.

HEATHER:

Thank you Alissa. Yeah, I have a suggested adjustment to the meeting on the second teleconference. It's under four, consensus process, and it's to the summing up on the comments that I made to the call. One of the sentences it's reading as not the intending meeting, or it's not quite capturing the point that I wanted to make. But I have, what I hope, is a quick and easy fix to the lack of clarity.

To take the sentence that begins, "She explains that GAC members..." To just remove part of the sentence, to simplify it. So that it then reads, "She explains that GAC members, on the ICG, could not vote on such narrow issues." And I can send this now to the Adobe room as well, so you have the precise text. But for the purposes of clarity, I think it's an important point, and with that, I would be able to agree to finalizing the minutes for the second teleconference.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, great, thank you Heather. If you don't mind, yeah, perfect, you just sent it into the mailing, I mean, into the chat window. If you wouldn't mind just sending it to the mailing list as well, that would be fantastic. We don't necessarily need two records, but it's always good to have it on the mailing list. Thank you.

Is there anyone else who has a suggested change or needs more time to approve the minutes?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hello. This is [inaudible] speaking. I have just joined, I'm sorry I'm a bit late. And I'm still joining the Adobe room, I'm not there yet.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. Thank you. I have Jean-Jacques in the queue. Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques speaking. Would it be possible for staff to put, on the window in meeting notes or in the larger window of Adobe Connect, the reference of the text as we're going through the

---

agenda? It's always useful to have the text, if possible, or at least the link in the community chat, so that we can check on the latest version, because it's sometimes a bit difficult to follow, and to know what is the very latest version of anything we're discussing. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. So we're actually looking at the minutes, I mean there is two sets of minutes that we're trying to approve right now. We're looking at one of them in the main window. I can see it. I don't know if others can see it.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. I meant, as a general principle, I didn't mean just on this specific point on the minutes. Thank you Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, okay, got it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible], I have difficulty with raise of hand. I have two points to make before you start to say yes, review of this document. How could I get to, because I have difficulty hand raising.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead. There is no one in the queue right now.

---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. Does it show that I'm in the queue, or you just give me the queue? [Inaudible]... I want two points to make before you start. First of all, I would like to request you, how you want to go through this document. I suggest that if you have not different approach, first, once we discuss some principle, I have two small principles for how to do that. Go through them page by page, if not to back and forth, from up to down.

To see if one part is finished, we approve that and we don't need to come back to that. This is the procedure. And then I have two comments to make. First comment. The consensus in the document is not a treaty. We need not to go to the GAC from A to Z, to see the total perfections. This is the result of the consensus among the ICG members, after collective efforts by many, many colleagues, two days, and in particular, the last week after 82 exchange of email.

It is not perfect. It should not be perfect. It should reflect the consensus and agreement of the people. So if there is no real mistake, we should not try to make any drafting or any change of the rules of any perfection. The only thing is the at the end [inaudible]... Or if the view of anybody has not been reflected properly in the document, you can raise it, but not starting re-drafting, or introducing your work. And I thank you very much.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you, those points are very well taken. I did just want to close on the minutes. I think we have approval for the minutes, and then we'll move on to the consensus document in one moment. So I think we

---

have approval for these minutes, pending the change suggested by Heather. So we will with [inaudible] to get that sorted.

So, with the introduction from [inaudible], let us move on to the consensus building document. And I am going to attempt to share from my screen the clean version.

Just give me one second.

Are people able to see the document?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. Okay. So what we are looking at is the version of the decision making document that I sent a little less than 24 hours ago. This is the clean version which incorporates the latest not editorial suggestions that were sent today, but anything that was sent up until yesterday. Let me increase the size.

And hopefully people can see it better now. Let me know if you can't see it. So, this is the version that we're looking at. It includes all of the editorials up until today, but not the ones from today, which we will go through in a separate section. So my first question that I think, you

---

know, people should be very familiar with the content of this document at this point. And as I stated, there has been many [inaudible].

We have been talking about this for a long time. So, I'd like to go through this in two steps. The first step would be to see if there are any substantive, non-editorial issues that people have that remain with this document. And the second phase, we will talk about editorial issues. So the first question is, whether anyone has a substantive point to raise. I hope we really don't need to go through one paragraph at a time.

We have looked at this document, we're all very familiar with it. So I'd rather that if people have substantive topics to bring up, that they do that now. Raise your hand or let me know that you want to be in the queue. And then we will move on to editorial. And I'm happy to scroll if people want to scroll to a particular portion, or obviously you all have it yourself on your own machines.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Hello Alissa, this is Jean-Jacques. Perhaps if staff could allow each of us to scroll at her or his own rhythm, that would be very convenient. Because, for instance, I have the post of point one and point two, thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. I think that's something Alice can do, I don't think that's something that I control.



---

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry, maybe I was not clear in my comments.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead. There is no queue.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I suggest that, as you mentioned, if there is no general comment, the first comment should be treated paragraph by paragraph. I request you kindly to start clear paragraph by paragraph, in order to allow us not to go back and forth to the various paragraphs. This is the way that I suggest if you agree and [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: So I guess my assumption here was that, if there were any substantive outstanding issues, that we can get to those first, with the hope that there wouldn't actually be very many of them. And then we can kind of get into editorial, and if we need to go paragraph by paragraph, that would be okay.

But again, given that this text has been, is very familiar to everyone, I'd rather that people just raise the issues that they have. And at the end, if we don't have any issues, then we will be done. And that would be fantastic and we have other things to talk about. So that's the approach that I think we should take. So the current question is substantive issues, and if we don't have any, that's perfectly fine.

So I see a question from Jean-Jacques about being able to scroll individually. I'm happy to hand the production back to staff, if people

---

feel that's necessary. Obviously, everyone has this document themselves, because it has been on the mailing list and Dropbox, and I definitely want to be able to do live editing myself when we get into the editorial section, but while we're talking about substantive issues, we can do it either way.

So if people feel that they need to scroll within the Adobe Connect, then we can give the production back to Alice.

So let's take, I don't know 30 more seconds, to see if anyone raises a substantive issue.

I see a lot of support in the chat room, which is good I think. Okay. So, how about look into some of these editorial issues? Since it doesn't seem that anyone has a substantive issue. So let's see here. So I think people should be seeing now a document that is marked editorial updates, can someone confirm that you can see editorial updates now?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes.

ALISSA COOPER: Great. So, this version of the document contains all of the editorial updates that were sent to the mailing list today. I believe those are from Lynn, [inaudible]... Wolf Ullrich possibly had a comment on one of them. So that's what we're looking at now, and I agree with the suggestion of [inaudible], I think we should take the time to look at these and allow people to comment on them.

---

So let's start in section one, if anyone has comments on the editorial suggestion made in section one which was made by Lynn.

RUSS MUNDI: My only question on that, this is Russ, is should we, since we're doing this secretariat RFP, should we also list them as not included in the decision making? Or should we just stop after full members of the ICG period?

ALISSA COOPER: I'm happy to include secretariat, that's certainly true.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi Alissa. Sorry, I didn't understand the question. What is the question please?

ALISSA COOPER: So I think that, the question here was whether to include the secretariat in the list of people who are not included in the decision making process. And actually, I realized that I cut off some words here, so. I think the suggestion would be something along these lines.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: May I make a proposal where you put that?

---

ALISSA COOPER:

I just did it within the live editing. So the proposal is that the second sentence of the document would now read, "Participation in the decision making process is reserved to the full members of the ICG, and hence does not include ICANN Board liaison, ICANN staff liaison, expert, or secretariat."

Any objections to this text I did?

Okay. So I think we are good with that one. Moving down to section two, another suggestion by Lynn, the new sentence that you can see in the third paragraph there where read, "At all times ICG members should expect and hold themselves to respectful articulation of any point of disagreement." So that's one change you can see, and the other one is a suggestion from Mary that the uppercase M in the word members be changed to lowercase, so that matches the usage in the rest of the document.

So comment on the text that you can see here.

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Alissa, it's Lynn. Maybe you're going to address this separately, but I had also suggested that the sentence above that will be edited somewhat to make it more clear. I don't know if you were going to...

ALISSA COOPER:

My apologies. I missed that. I thought it was just a repetition of what was already there. So let me try to work that in.

---

LYNN ST. AMOUR: It was just that [a course expressed between them], is obviously not grounds for...

ALISSA COOPER: Oh, I see.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Alissa, may I comment about chapter two? This is Jean-Jacques.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes. Just give me one second to finish this. Lynn, is the version on the screen accurately reflects your suggestion?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: I think so. [Inaudible]...

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Go ahead Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is about the first sentence under number two. It will be, where it says SOIs. A statement of interest, but I thought this was about the conflict of interest. Because statement of interest, I mean, we all have already out there somewhere in the archives, all of our statements of interest about why we chose to be candidates for the coordination group. That's something completely different.

---

I think what is important is statement of conflict of interest, so that everyone knows that for instance, A) works for this cooperation; B) works for this or that community group, etc. Isn't that the case? Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So perhaps, I don't know if Wolf Ullrich is on this call or not, this was text that he suggested. My personal understanding was that the statements, since the statement of interest that we all gave contained essentially the information that you just described Jean-Jacques, that that was covered. But Wolf Ullrich, I will defer to you.

WOLF ULLRICH:

Yeah, thanks Alissa and Jean-Jacques. Wolf speaking. Well, the text is taken from what is in the GNSO working group guidelines. So as usual, us members are providing advice there, and that was from the beginning here in this text. So when we started with the text, and the statement of interest includes, statement of conflict [inaudible], that we were asking, that what I understood we were asking, Jean-Jacques, is where people are associated with and working with, so that it's included if you were to that SOI form in the related link, then you will see that.

So that's what is behind it. Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Yes. This is Jean-Jacques. If I may answer to that. Thank you Wolf for the explanation. But, you see, I think that the GNSO definition perhaps is a bit narrower. I've seen throughout ICANN, and by the way

---

elsewhere, but also when I was a member of the ICANN Board, that statement of interest is something which is published right at the beginning. That's quite normal.

Here what we're talking about actually, should be more accurately defined. It is that anyone who considers that he has or may have a conflict of interest, should declare that conflict of interest. For instance, I don't know, I'll say anything, but my name is Larry Page, and I invented Google for instance. So it's a simple statement, and it indicates a possible conflict of interest, that's all.

If I may add something. You see, the problem with SOI statement of interest is that it is ambiguous. It is used in many different ways, in different contexts. For instance, when you're applying for a position on the, let's say, the ISOC Board of Trustees, you submit a SOI. When you submit something for the ICANN Board, it's the same, etc. So that doesn't say, and does not necessarily contain the notion of conflict of interest.

I think what is important here, especially under the heading of individual and group behavior and norms, it is the conflict of interest. That statement is important. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

So this is Alissa. Just one follow up question for you Jean-Jacques. Do you envision that, you know, as you said, we have all made statements and there is a matrix that we published that contains all of the information that we have provided about where we work, and where

---

our funding comes from, and all of that. Do you envision that there is actually more physically that we each need to disclose?

Or if we sort of change the language here to say, "Statement of Interest and Conflict of Interest," that would establish the right norm, which we have already met because we have all disclosed that information already.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes. Thank you Alissa. Thank you Alissa. I think your question is very enlightening because it points exactly to the problem. I'm not calling for more disclosure, after all, it's left up to each of us to determine whether she or he considers what is already published is sufficient. It's a matter of moral trust, but here, at least of establishing norms. It says so in the title, "Individual and Group Behavior and Norms."

So I think we should state the norm, which is that it is normal, or it is, there should be statement of conflict of interest. It's very currently in the United States and North America, it is called [inaudible], conflict of interest. Thanks.

Well if you want to put both as someone is doing just now, I don't mind. I mean, provided you put [inaudible], I'm fine with this.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. So I did a little edit, people should look at that. Wolf Ullrich is in the queue. So go ahead.



---

WOLF ULLRICH:

Thank you. Wolf speaking. Just briefly, Jean-Jacques, the SOI is saying fixed term and it relates to a fixed statement, which is, you know, our time, and has a kind of form and format, which is in the GNSO point of view. Especially, in the GNSO, for example, they do the following over the time, GNSO IA and the COI, [inaudible] is may vary or may alter, since, you know, this working group is working for more than one year, for example, and people are changing and moving around to other duties.

So what we are doing is, we are asking at each meeting, whether there has been a change of somebody, a SOI. In most case, there is not an answer to that, but it's a form, it's a kind of form that you're doing. So and we should think about that, we should do that without [inaudible], and then it's covered. Thanks.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you Wolf, if I may answer. This is Jean-Jacques. Fine. But if I may, here again, propose a wide experience, which is based on the Board of ICANN, which is larger than the GNSO, its remit. And in the Board of ICANN, it's necessary to underline at the level of principles and norms, that conflict of interest statement should be made. So, I think that this motion just proposed by Alissa satisfies both your point of view Wolf, which is based on GNSO practice, and the conflict of interest, which I suggested adding, because that is something which is much more appropriate under behavior and norms. Thank you.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you to you both. So I know that there was some slightly different text just in the chat room. I think they essentially covered the same thing, although maybe not. [Inaudible] So, I guess, let's see if I can view this on the fly. To accommodate...

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. I agree with [inaudible] suggestion. In other words, SOIs to include any conflicts of interest are required.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: And you could put after conflicts of interest, brackets TOI. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay. I think we should move on. It sounds like we have a solution here, people seem happy enough, as far as I can tell. So let's do that. Thank you for that point. So if we come down, so down here at the bottom of this first page, Mary had, [inaudible] had noted that the link in the footnotes, right here, was not operational. If you followed the link, it didn't lead you to anything.

And Wolf Ullrich has provided that corrected link. So, unless there are any comments on that, I will continue to scroll. Okay.

---

MARY: This is Mary.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, Mary, go ahead.

MARY: Because I'm not on the chatroom or Adobe, may I know the paragraph you are on, the third please?

ALISSA COOPER: Sure. The one that I was just referring to is the footnote on the first page. And I will try to keep saying which text we're talking about.

MARY: Sorry, what was my last [inaudible]...?

ALISSA COOPER: The hyperlink in the footnote was non-functional, it did not lead... It lead to a broken leak. So Wolf Ullrich provided the corrected link, which now works.

Okay. So moving down to section three, the third paragraph in section three, between [inaudible] and Glenn, and possibly others, there were a few word edits that were made in the third paragraph on section three, I won't read it. I will let people read it for themselves. But please comment if you have comments to make about this text.

---

And I should note here, there was also a comment about possibly, I think, deleting since the last paragraph here, or changing the order of the paragraph. And I sort of thought, again, the perfect [inaudible] of the good, and actually left in all the text that had been there, and left it in the same order, and hopefully it means essentially the same thing, regardless of which order it is in.

So that was kind of [inaudible] executive decision.

Okay. Hearing, seeing some agreement in the chat room and not hearing any objections, I will continue to scroll. So section four, we actually didn't have any more editorial in part A. Perhaps or in part B, as it turns out. Let me just see down here if there was any other changes. No, that was the last change that was suggested today, was that change in section three.

So at this point, I mean we've already said if anyone wanted to bring up substantive issues, and there weren't any of those, does anyone have a burning editorial issue that we haven't discussed? On any part of the document, any page, any section.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me Alissa [CROSSTALK]... what section?

ALISSA COOPER: Section, sorry one second Jean-Jacques. So section three looks like we had a lot of additional editorial suggestions. So at this point, the question is, does anyone have any other editorial suggestions on any part of the document? I'm glad to sort of keep scrolling slowly to see if

---

people want to do that one more time, but I think we're essentially closing in on finalizing the document.

So Jean-Jacques and then [inaudible], are in the queue.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. Do you mind, Alissa, coming back just to the last paragraph of two? I'm sorry, I have to invoke my old age to justify my slow pace, but those two paragraphs, actually, yes. So, my question, don't move it too much otherwise I'll lose track. There is a paragraph that starts by, "The ICG will make all reasonable efforts to enable stakeholder communities to have appropriate time, etc."

The next sentence, "Where appropriate and practical, public comment periods will also be provided." So I should have noted this much earlier during the email exchanges, but I must confess that I missed that. Now it strikes me that it is a bit, how should I say? A bit ambiguous. I mean, whether we do something or we don't, so where appropriate and practical, public comment periods will also be provided.

I think that throughout the Internet governance area, and especially in ICANN at least, public comment periods are not left to the appreciation of groups. I mean, it is principle. So could anyone give me guidance on this and see whether this sentence, as it stands now, is [inaudible]? Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: So I can just give my reaction, or my interpretation of this. I think, you know, it depends a little bit on what that substantive decision is. But,

---

there are some decisions where we have made where we have not sought public comment, and I think that maybe we wouldn't need to, for example, the scheduling of our next meeting. You know, I'm sure if we thought about all of the decisions we've made since July, we can come up with a couple others.

So I was assuming that was the intent here, was that we will certainly have public comment periods for anything related to the content of the transition. It's not the case for every single decision that we make, we will have a comment period. But that was just my interpretation. [Inaudible] is in the queue, did you want to speak to this issue, or did you have a separate issue?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, it's a separate one. Just a minor editorial thing, on page two, the fourth paragraph under section three, I think. There is a missing full stop at the end of the paragraph.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So other comments about public comment periods?

RUSS MUNDI: This is Russ. I can say that I interpreted it the same you did, just articulated when I read it that internal decisions didn't need public comment periods, but other things like charters and timelines and so on, we have had public comment. And that's what we meant.

---

ALISSA COOPER: So Jean-Jacques, does that seem reasonable to you now? If we assume that this covers the waterfront of all decisions that we might make?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Yes, thank you Alissa. This is Jean-Jacques. For me, it's okay. It's just that I wanted to make sure that we, as the coordination group, would not run into trouble, because we do not apply the ordinary rules. And I must say that I've forgotten, I don't know whether, for instance, in ICANN public comment periods are compulsory, as it were.

Or, it's just where appropriate and practical, I have a slight doubt about that. But if someone can only, in an authoritative way, that is from the legal standpoint, or from the point of view of, let's say, the ATRT, fine. I have no problem. But I just wanted to make sure, does anyone on this call, who is a member of ICG have any experience working in ATRT 1 or 2?

So, if I may quote my friend and colleague Alan Greenberg, who sent me another chat, unrelated to this Adobe Connect chat. His opinion, which is, "Some ICANN processes require public comment, such as specific places in the PDP. Others, this is a judgment call, etc." So, I think that with that, I would accept the formulation as it is.

Please understand that I was not trying to bring up a new point, it was just that I wanted to make sure that we wouldn't put ourselves on the wrong side of some argument. Thanks.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you for relaying that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have a question Alissa.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think, if you read this paragraph. The first part is clear, "The ICG will make all reasonable efforts to make the stakeholder communities to have appropriate time to consult an issue [inaudible] will make substantively." This is clear. Then we have [inaudible], and then we have, "Where appropriate and practical, public comments will also be provided." This is, who decides that it is appropriate?

[Inaudible] would give a clearer to the public comment, this is my question.

[CROSSTALK]

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: This is Jean-Jacques. Exactly, that was the point. But I see on the chat, [inaudible] and Alissa, I see that [inaudible] was on ATRT 1 and [inaudible] was on ATRT 2. May I suggest Alissa, that you invite both of them to give their authoritative view on this so that we can go on to something else?

---



ALISSA COOPER:                    Anyone is free to speak. [Inaudible] had her hand and it's now down.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:        Alissa, this is [inaudible], I also want to speak, but I can't raise my hand.

ALISSA COOPER:                    Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:        Yeah, I was going to make the point that our charter does say pretty clearly that public really is our comment period, and so I think for the substantive things, we are covered already with the charter. I'm personally happy with the text in the [inaudible] document of this.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:        Alissa, can I ask again a question please?

ALISSA COOPER:                    So we have a queue now. So Wolf Ullrich and then [inaudible], and then of course, [inaudible] if you would like to speak, please get in the queue.

WOLF ULLRICH:                    Thanks Alissa, it's Wolf speaking. I think here, you know, we didn't get to that point. If I put in the sentence here, by saying certain people, we would like to have criteria on where to decide on a public comment

---

---

period or not. So it's clear, it's really clear to this community, to this group, that there should be public comment period. So I was thinking whether it may help because it's included here in the paragraph.

It's called principles, or so, or behavior, group behavior, so it's not to decide upon specific kind of public comments here. But it maybe, if we just read it like this, you know, it is seen as appropriate and practical. It is seen as appropriate and practical to provide public comment periods. So that's what is it behind, and [inaudible] in the charter is also text, is that it's fully clear. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Go ahead [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Alissa, my problem is not the substance of the text. The way it is drafted. I understand that there would be a possibility of a public comment. I understand that where appropriate and practical, first of all, who decides I understand, if I'm right? ICG will decide. Then if will be decided, then this is will also be provided, who. Because it clearly mentions, where appropriate and practical, ICG will provide sufficient, or I don't know, appropriate period of public comment.

We should say who will decide that, by whom? That is the problem [inaudible] this small paragraph, or small sentence. I have no problem with...

---

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Okay, so please take a look at the edit, which is just suggested by Jean-Jacques, which I think I got correct, which I think speaks definitely to that point and [inaudible].

JEAN-JACQUES: Hello Alissa, this is Jean-Jacques. Yes, I think that you captured it exactly.

ALISSA COOPER: So, maybe, if I [CROSSTALK]...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was on the queue. Thank you. This is [inaudible] again. Sorry, I was on mute. I'm happy with the suggestion of Jean-Jacques. And I was just going to say that, as far as I recall, what ATRT 1 has done was that we had one set of output that went through public comments. We had also non-substantial issues like, who is going to chair the meeting? And who are the vice chairs and so on, which did not go, of course, for public comments.

But we did not get into those specific issues. We did not everything in writing, if I may say. So it was just like, procedure things, went internally within the group, and substantial issues which was basically one document went for public comment. But again, I think the text Jean-Jacques suggested is fine. Thank you.

---

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. Joe, allow me to invoke the chair's privilege for a second, and let's see what happens after that. It sounds like we don't have, like we have agreement on the edits as it appears on the screen, which has deleted the full stop. Now adding a clause at the end of the sentence that this includes public comment period. If there are, Joe, unless you have an objection to that? I would love it if we can wrap.

MARY: Alissa, this is Mary. Alissa?

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, go ahead Mary.

MARY: This is Mary. Can I go ahead?

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead. It appears that Joe has lowered his hand. Go ahead Mary.

MARY: Okay. Please, since I'm not in the chatroom, I'm not seeing the Adobe, can you read out what Jean-Jacques added to....

ALISSA COOPER: Yeah. Yes, yes. I'm sorry. So this is the last paragraph of section two. The first sentence now reads as follows: "The ICG will make all reasonable efforts to enable stakeholder communities to have

---

appropriate time to consult on issues which the ICG will make substantive decisions, including through public comment period.”

MARY: Okay.

ALISSA COOPER: And then the next sentence continues as before, “Public comments received as a result of a public consultation.” Blah, blah, blah.

MARY: All right, thank you. I’m happy with that, I don’t have a problem with this. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you. So, I would like to ask if there are any further objections to adopting this document?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Alissa, I have a problem with that.

ALISSA COOPER: Okay, go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think you...

ALISSA COOPER: Please say your name.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. I believe that at the end of what [inaudible] proposed, we can correct, including [inaudible]. You need to add comma, where practical and appropriate. Some may not be practical. So we have to add this [inaudible] part, in order to allow ICG to decide on the situation and not totally tying the hand of the ICG.

ALISSA COOPER: Is that not accommodated by the fact that we say, "We'll make reasonable efforts" at the beginning of the sentence?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Alissa, I'm sorry. You know how much trouble I have of all of this, [inaudible] and I think that the sentence, including where practical and appropriate. I have no problem to reasonable or not, but I think this should immediately come after this including, because this go to including. It doesn't go to suitable or enable for the stakeholders. It goes to the providing at the time, so it goes to the including.

So after the including so and so, this is where, practical and appropriate.

ALISSA COOPER: Jean-Jacques, could you live with where practical and appropriate?

---

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: If that is the price to pay, I don't mind.

ALISSA COOPER: I like to hear that. Okay. Okay. So, this has now been edited. Final clause at the end of the sentence, including two public comment periods, comma, where practical and appropriate. Now, are there any objections to adopting this document? The whole document.

I hear none, I see none in the chatroom. So I believe we can, we have consensus to adopt this document, and I will work on producing a clean version and send it to Alice to get it up on the website. So thank you, a huge thank you to everyone for your efforts on this document.

And now, we have very little time left, but I would like very much to talk about ICANN 51. So, hopefully people can see on the... In the meeting room, you can see a list of our schedule. We have two confirmed events at ICANN 51. A public session with the community, which will be on Thursday morning, and we've talked a little bit about the structure of that. I don't really want to talk about that today.

Patrik is leading the charge on the agenda for that session. And we have our working meeting scheduled for October 17<sup>th</sup>, which is an all-day meeting like the one we had on September 6<sup>th</sup>. The question that we have open, I think is about side meetings with various ICANN constituencies.

I sent a long mail about this not too long ago. Many of your read it. We had some discussion about this on September 6<sup>th</sup>. The idea of these

---

---

meetings be that we would have a high [inaudible] exchange with various different communities, about how they can engage in the operational community processes of transition plan development. So, I'm hoping we can say, we can go a couple of minutes over and have some quick discussion about this.

I know people have been, some people have been in favor, some people have been opposed to this idea, and then I really need to get back to the people in the GAC and ALAC, and other communities who have asked about these meetings. They are, the people that I'm talking to are very much in favor of this kind of engagement, and they need to get their schedules done.

So please join the queue if you have an opinion about this, and we'll try to spend five minutes on this if possible. [Inaudible], go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Yeah, so this is [inaudible]. My opinion is that it would be useful to have some of these discussions. My experience is when we talk about what's going on in our community, it would be useful for other people to understand that and it's also useful for people for us. I don't know if there are ICG level things to discuss at this stage. Maybe there are, I'm not saying there isn't, I don't have many of those [landmine?], but I do think that from communities would benefit from direct discussion with the GAC, or [inaudible] ICANN meetings.

And I would certainly support that and be willing to contribute to such meetings. So.



ALISSA COOPER: Joe, go ahead.

JOE ADHADEFF: Yeah, thanks. I guess my comment is kind of along the lines of what [inaudible] was saying, in terms of, I think there is mutual understanding to be had. So for instance, I can easily imagine that some questions that might come up in an exchange with ALAC, would also be useful to an audience that included members in the business community.

And I was trying to figure out if there was a way to blend these sessions, into a larger version of the public community session so that everyone gets the benefit from hearing that, as opposed to having all of the one off meetings that are being suggested as additional.

ALISSA COOPER: Thanks Joe. From my perspective, I wasn't really viewing them as an either/or. I was just viewing the side meeting as...

JOE ADHADEFF: What I'm suggesting is that the questions that are going to be asked in these separate meetings, the answers to them may be something useful and if we're having people who aren't part of the ICANN community perhaps try to join for a meeting to hear that, then their opportunity is going to be limited to one thing.

---

They're not going to be there because they're not part of the ICANN process for the entire thing.

ALISSA COOPER:

Fabio.

FABIO:

Yes, thank you Alissa. My comment is a little bit in line with what Joe just said. I think it will better serve the purpose of this kind of meeting if the consultation happened publically where everybody can benefit from everybody else. It is good to have, to meet people, but my concern is about sustainability of their approach, because that is one forum, and we can have...

Or the forum where people would like to have, you know, a direct dialogue with the ICG, and they won't be able to have it. But as we have already space within the ICANN program, where we are holding a public meeting or consultation with the community, maybe we should craft that consultation session in the way that we give enough time to different ICANN constituency, to come up with their question or concern, which mean we communicate to them, very politely declining the direct consultation, but requesting them to prepare their concern and their question.

And raise them to read the public consultation that we are going to hold on Thursday, so that it would make it open to everybody. We don't duplicate a thing, and I think it's also more open, more transparent.

---

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you. Heather, go ahead.

HEATHER:

Thank you. So, I think I'm very much in line with the thinking around having the public session, as well as doing some additional meetings focused on particular parts of the community. As with any meetings, it's good to be clear about how those meetings would be structured and so forth. And I know that Patrik is going to do his utmost to prepare, and help to structure those changes if we do have some with various parts of the community at ICANN.

Just to offer some explanation about why this request has come from the GAC, to have an exchange with the ICG. It's really because of, I guess, the culture, or the expectations, that governments have about trying to understand processes like this. And we heard early on in the ICG process about the importance of having, or being attentive to the political dimension of this work and acknowledging that if governments are engaged at the beginning, and have some degree of comfort with how things are going to proceed, that really it's going to be beneficial to the process overall.

And for governments having the ICG make the effort and draw first and foremost on the GAC participants there is in the ICG to lead an exchange, that will be seen very positively. And if the ICG does not meet with the GAC in this case, it's possible that that could be seen negatively, or you could have missed an opportunity to help some understanding among government representatives.

---

And I don't think we can really underestimate the degree of challenge we still have to communicate about how the coordination group is working in related matters to that. So, I would really encourage you to view this as a really good opportunity for the ICG, as I said at an earlier meeting, it's a bit of diplomacy that the ICG, I think, can afford.

And there is only a positive to come from it, whereas if we did not have this meeting, it could be understood negatively, and a really good chance to do some briefing and to get governments better acquainted with this process, which has been missed. So I hope that explains at least what is driving the request coming from the GAC. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Thank you Heather. So, I think, and I know that we're over time all ready, so I want to be respectful of people's time. So here is what I would suppose, I think we can do a couple of things, and people have suggested these in the chatroom as well. I think one thing we can do is attempt to extend our existing public sessions by some length.

My impression is that we don't have a lot of flexibility scheduling just at the moment, but we can talk to Alice about that and see if we can get a little more time so that we make sure that we have enough time to do a sort of in-depth community engagement.

I think the other thing that would make sense is for the communities that have requested, specifically, you know time to talk to ICG members, I can respond to them and say that, at the very minimum, there are individuals from some operational communities, you know,

---

not necessarily representing the ICG, who are interested in that kind of engagement.

Certainly the IETF slash IAB, there is at least one of them because I know that the IETF and IAB are interested in doing the one off engagement, and so that they can proceed with their scheduling, and we can continue discussing on the mailing list, I can issue a call on this list that there are other individuals from specific communities who want to join in, and do that jointly. Then we can perhaps take that off line, or if it looks like there is actually a lot of interest from ICG folks, then we can sort of revert to doing it as an ICG thing.

But I think for now, we need to get back to them on the schedule point, so I think that we should tell them that there is at least community interest, even if there is not necessarily ICG consensus that it should be an ICG initiative.

MARY: Alissa? Mary here.

ALISSA COOPER: Go ahead Mary.

MARY: I understand [inaudible]... want to discuss, and propose, I did say in the mailing list, when do we consider the cross community working groups within the [inaudible], that you have all of the [inaudible] there, and that if we have interaction with them, is it possible for those that would

---

be [inaudible] in the group, the proposals, [inaudible] ask questions and [inaudible] to them, apart from the working forum. I don't know if we should consider that, [inaudible]. Or consider it ICANN community, including GAC and all the other constituencies in ICANN.

If it is acceptable that [inaudible] ...GAC, which would allow them access [inaudible]... the GAC working group, [inaudible] working group at least come up with [inaudible].

ALISSA COOPER: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have raised my hand. I don't know whether it was seen by you or not. If there is still time.

ALISSA COOPER: Yes, just one follow up with Mary, and then over to you [inaudible]. So I guess my question on that, Mary, is who is doing the scheduling for that group? And I will follow up with you off line, we can figure out how the scheduling is working for that group, or that session. Go ahead, and then I'll think we'll wrap up.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I tend agree to agree with Joe, and [inaudible], and with the summary that you have given for the time being. We don't need to foresee such an individual meeting or an individual community until [inaudible]

---

issues. Remit the number to the minimum, absolute minimum necessary, and make it larger but not explicitly for a specific group.

So I say we do those two proposals and plus what you have summarized at the end. Thank you.

ALISSA COOPER:

Great. Thank you. So I think we should close. I will send a note to the mailing list that sort of explains the proposal here for moving forward. But it sounds that at the very least, we need to ask for more time for the ICG and see what we get out of that, and we'll continue the rest of the discussion on the mailing list, and I will respond to the scheduling list to indicate that individual communities might be interested, but perhaps not the full ICG.

So with that, I think we should close the call. Thank you everyone for your time.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**